# INDEPENDENT ASSESMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS EVALUATION GROUP

# 2004- 2012

# A SUMMATIVE ANALYSIS AND THE WAY FORWARD

# ANNEXES TO REPORT

# APRIL 2013

**JUPS KLUYSKENS**
**CARROL FAUBERT**

# 1 ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Independent Assessment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)**

**Background:**
**The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)** is a professional network that brings together the units responsible for evaluation in the UN system including the specialized agencies, funds, programmes and affiliated organisations. UNEG currently has 43 such members and three observers. UNEG aims to strengthen the objectivity, effectiveness and visibility of the evaluation function across the UN system and to advocate the importance of evaluation for learning, decision making and accountability. UNEG provides a forum for members to establish common norms and standards for evaluation; develop methodologies addressing UN concerns; strengthen evaluation functions through peer review and information exchange and establish partnerships with the wider evaluation community.

UNEG's predecessor dates back to 1984 when it operated as a more informal Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG). The IAWG was principally a forum for exchange of information and practices; it held annual or bi-annual general meetings. The IAWG worked on a variety of issues including the linkages between Monitoring & Evaluation and Results-Based Management, strengthening evaluation capacities of national governments and UN agencies, country level and UNDAF evaluations.

In 2004, the United Nations Evaluation Group was established to proactively work together towards achieving a set of objectives of relevance to its membership by producing agreed deliverables. Shortly after, the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System (2005) were approved by UNEG. The UNEG Norms and Standards were recognized as "a landmark for the harmonization and simplification of the evaluation function in the United Nations system" by United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/62/253 (Dec 2007). They remain the most widely quoted UNEG product to date. AT the same time, the concept of UNEG membership was introduced to create a sense of ownership of deliverables and a sense of responsibility to participate and abide by the normative products. Over the following years, important progress was made towards professionalizing the evaluation function in the UN system (elaboration of competencies for evaluators, job descriptions, evaluation policies, ethical guidelines for evaluations, etc.). Furthermore, UNEG participated actively in peer reviews of the individual evaluation functions of its members to help strengthen their independence, credibility and usefulness. UNEG also increasingly focused on relevant UN Reform issues such as the Delivering as One evaluations, system-wide evaluation, etc. and developed guidance for integrating UN core principles – gender equality and human rights – into evaluation.

Seeking to professionalize as a network, UNEG approved its "Principles of Working Together" (PoWT) in 2007 (revised in 2009, 2011 and 2012). These principles:

1. lay out UNEG's mission and strategic approach (an 8-point plan to promote the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function in the UN);
2. define UNEG membership (it is institutional and open to the units with the main responsibility for evaluation in each UN organization);
3. clarify UNEG's governance structure (UNEG is governed by the Heads of member evaluation units, facilitated by an elected Chair and vice-Chair; the AGM is the main decision-making forum) and describe the procedure for electing the Chair/vice-Chair;
4. spell out the convening of "UNEG Task Forces" with voluntary membership as the main UNEG working modality and explain how a "UNEG Coordination Committee" chaired by the UNEG Chair/vice-Chair facilitates and tracks implementation of the work programme in-between AGMs;

5. Stipulate the roles of the UNEG Executive Coordinator and Secretariat (managing the voluntary contributions by UNEG members that constitute the UNEG budget, supporting the entirety of UNEG's work including the organization of the AGM and the Coordination Committee, maintaining a knowledge network accessible to all evaluation staff and partners, and supporting Task Forces).
6. Eight years after its establishment, UNEG decided to embark on an assessment process in order to gauge its achievements, shortcomings and challenges so far as a professional evaluation network in the UN system, and to analyze the adequacy of its current structure and functioning.

**Purpose, objectives and scope:**

More specifically, the **purpose** of the independent UNEG assessment is to make available a summative analysis about what has worked in UNEG, what has not and why, and a formative view to enhance learning about what could be done to further improve the work of the group. The assessment will provide important information for revising the UNEG Principles of Working Together and for any redefinition of UNEG's structure and modalities of work. In particular, the assessment results will be used to elaborate UNEG's Strategic Plan, to establish an accountability structure for UNEG, and to inform decision-making at UNEG's Annual General Meeting in April 2013. Furthermore, the UNEG Secretariat, Bureau, Coordination Committee, Task Forces and other UNEG stakeholders can learn from the process of documenting good practices and lessons learned which can then be shared with external stakeholders and be used for promoting the network.

The **objectives** of the assessment are:

1. To assess the contribution made by UNEG against its "Mission Statement and Strategic Approach" (Principles of Working Together, PoWT, part II) through making judgements using evaluation criteria based on evidence; and against the role that UNEG could most usefully play, as seen by its members and by relevant stakeholders;
2. To assess UNEG's internal structure and functioning against the membership criteria, governance principles and working modalities laid out in the PoWT (part III to VI);
3. To identify the factors that have enabled and affected UNEG in fulfilling its mission, responding to members' expectations, and in its functioning, by answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks;
4. To reach conclusions concerning UNEG's achievements, innovations and strategic approach, based on the assessments and analyses as above;
5. 3
6. To provide actionable recommendations for improving UNEG's work, especially for incorporation into the revised Principles of Working Together document and a UNEG Strategic Plan. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the assessment.

The **scope** covered by the assessment includes:

1. **Relevance**. The extent to which UNEG's strategic approach (PoWT, Art. 3) has been relevant to the realisation of UNEG's mission (PoWT, II) and the extent to which UNEG has responded to UN system priorities and UNEG member's needs and expectations.
2. **Effectiveness**. The degree to which UNEG activities have contributed to achieving UNEG's strategic objectives. The assessment should also note how unintended results, if any, have affected UNEG positively or negatively and to what extent they have been foreseen and managed.
3. **Efficiency**. The extent to which UNEG's strategic objectives have been achieved through the working modalities and decision-making structures in place, with the appropriate amount of

resources and by maintaining low transaction costs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

4. **Sustainability**. The extent to which UNEG's current structure, functioning, resource flows and budget are likely to continue to achieve UNEG's purpose.

**Enabling / explanatory factors:** While assessing performance using the above criteria, the evaluators will identify the various factors that can explain the performance. This will allow lessons to be learned about why UNEG performed as it did. The following factors can be assumed to affect performance:

- Coordination challenges[1]
- Values and normative underpinnings as a United Nations group
- Use of external partnerships (DAC, ECG, IOCE, various clients such as ECOSOC, CEB, GA, Executive Boards, etc.)
- Sense of ownership by UNEG members (participation, perception of transparency/accountability)
- Capacity of UNEG member organizations to engage effectively (human/financial resources)
- Diversity of members and roles (development vs. normative vs. humanitarian, etc.)

The time period covered by the assessment is May 2004 through October 2012. However, as the assessment is formative, it shall focus on recent years and the current status quo with regards to UNEG functioning (membership, task forces and governance structure/decision-making). With regards to the UNEG budget, deliverables and documents a more longitudinal approach shall be taken. 4

**Methodology:**

**Overall approach**: The UNEG assessment is formative in nature with a summative analysis of the work of the group in the past. As a network evaluation, it should be participatory, take a systems-approach and combine an appropriate mix of methods. Other comparable evaluation networks (DAC Evalnet, Evaluation Cooperation Group, etc.) shall be used as benchmarks.

**Data collection methods**: The UNEG assessment will draw on a variety of data collection methods including, but not limited to:

- Desk-review focusing on UNEG documents and benchmarking UNEG against other comparable networks
- SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats)
- Self-administered survey of current UNEG membership, including basic demographic data (sex, age, nationality, etc.)
- Semi-structured interviews and/or focus groups with a total of 70-100 key stakeholders (mainly by phone/Skype or in virtual meeting spaces/discussion fora)
- One visit each to Geneva and New York

Data collection methods must be linked to the evaluation criteria and assessment questions that are included within the scope. An evaluation matrix and detailed methodology including questionnaire/interview guide will be elaborated in the inception report, linking these elements together. Sampling for semi-structured interviews shall consider broad representation of the

---

[1] See literature on network evaluation, e.g. Davies, 2003; Creech & Ramji, 2004; Ramalingam & Mendizabal, 2008; Allee & Schwabe, 2009.

different UNEG member units by size and function (evaluation only vs. monitoring & evaluation vs. audit, inspection and evaluation, etc.).

**Data analysis and validation**: The UNEG assessment will use a variety of validation methods to ensure that the data and information used and conclusions made carry the necessary depth. Triangulation of information sources and findings improve validity, quality and use.

**Management and Conduct of the Assessment:**

**Management Structure**:
- Management Group: The UNEG Bureau (UNEG Chair/vice-Chair and Secretariat) is responsible for managing the assessment process and ensuring its professional conduct.
- Steering Group: Convened by an independent Chair, a representative group of UNEG Heads and selected non-UNEG members oversees the assessment process, ensuring the finalization and proper implementation of the ToR. The group provides guidance to the assessment team in the inception phase and reviews the inception and draft assessment reports for their acceptability.

**Assessment Team**:
- A (senior) Team Leader with at least 10 years of relevant experience in evaluation, including the experience to lead network evaluations, and in-depth knowledge of the UN System. The Team Leader will be responsible for completing the report of the highest professional quality.
- A (mid-level) Team Specialist with at least 5 years of relevant evaluation experience.
- The workload is estimated to be equivalent to 40 working days for the Team Leader and 30 days for the Team Specialist.

**Process and Timeline:**
There are three main stages in the UNEG assessment process:

**June-October 2012: Preparation.** The preparatory stage includes reflection on the assessment with stakeholders and establishing the Steering and Management Groups. The ToR will be prepared and the assessment consultants will be recruited (through UNDP procurement).

**November 2012 - January 2013: Conduct / implementation.** The assessment team will prepare an inception report that will operationalize the design elements laid out in this ToR for review by the Steering Group. Data will be collected accordingly and preliminary findings and a draft report will be presented to the Steering Group. Based on its feedback, a final draft report will be produced for circulation among UNEG Heads.

**February - April 2013: Follow-up and use.** Once the assessment report is completed and validated by UNEG Heads, it is made publicly available by posting on the UNEG website. The assessment will feed into two internal UNEG processes in preparation of the UNEG Annual General Meeting: First, revising the UNEG Principles of Working Together and redefining UNEG's structure and modalities of work; and second, elaborating a Strategic Plan and establishing an accountability structure for UNEG (in lieu of management response).

**April 2013**: The Team Leader will present the assessment conclusions and recommendations at the UNEG AGM in New York.

**Addenda for Team Leader (A) and Team Specialist (B):**
ADDENDUM for the Team Leader (A)
**1. Responsibilities**

The assessment team (Team Leader and Team Specialist) will be collectively responsible for completing all the deliverables of this exercise as specified in the assessment Terms of Reference. In particular, the Team Leader will be responsible for taking the lead on the following:

- Leading the preparation of the Inception Report.
- Leading the preparation of a data collection plan that contains:
- The details of data collection activities to be undertaken, indicating - for each element of the "Mission Statement and Strategic Approach" - the method of data collection, UNEG activities to be covered, sources of information, the responsible team member, timeframe, interview and survey questions, format of the expected output / format of reports form data collection activities;
- Mission plans (Geneva and New York).
- Leading the analysis of the data collected and the preparation of a presentation on preliminary findings to the Steering Group.
- Completing a first draft report of acceptable quality that covers all the requirements provided in the Terms of Reference.
- Revisions of the draft as required in the review process.
- Presenting the final report to the UNEG AGM in April 2013.

- As supervisor of the Team Specialist, the Team Leader will be responsible for:
- Supervision of the planning and analysis conducted by the Team Specialist, providing timely feedback to the input provided by the Team Specialist.

## 2. Deliverables

(i) The Inception Report including a data collection plan that meets the specifications of the ToR.
(ii) Reports from individual data collection activities as outlined in the data collection plan.
(iii) Presentation of preliminary findings from data analysis to the Steering Group.
(iv) The first draft of the assessment report.
(v) Revisions to the draft as required.
(vi) Presentation of the report to UNEG stakeholders.

## 3. Contract period

The contract period will be from 1 November 2012 to 30 April 2013. 7
## 4. Fee and payment schedule

The contract will be arranged as a lump-sum amount covering the consultant fees and payable upon completion of the above deliverables, according to the milestones highlighted below. All travel-related costs (e.g. ticket, daily allowances, terminal expenses, etc.) will be settled separately based on actual costs and as per UNDP rules.

| The payment will be made in the following instalments: Completion of the deliverables | Payment as a percentage of the fee |
|---|---|
| Deliverable (i) | 20% |
| Deliverables (ii) – (iv) | 50% |
| Deliverables (v) – (vi) | 30% |

## 2 ANNEX B: EVALUATION UNITS AND THEIR PLACEMENT, REPORTING LINES IN UNEG MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS: ALL 46 FULL MEMBERS, OBSERVERS AND OTHERS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Entities with Stand-Alone Evaluation Units reporting directly to either the Head of Organization or the Governing Body (19 organisations = 41.3%)** | 1. UNCTAD |
| | 2. ITC |
| | 3. UNDP |
| | 4. UNCDF |
| | 5. UNV |
| | 6. UNEP |
| | 7. UN-HABITAT |
| | 8. UNODC |
| | 9. UN-WOMEN |
| | 10. WFP |
| | 11. FAO |
| | 12. IFAD |
| | 13. ILO |
| | 14. UNIDO |
| | 15. CTBTO |
| | 16. GEF |
| | 17. JIU |
| | 18. MDG-F |
| | 19. World Bank |
| **Entities with Evaluation co-located with Oversight Units (12 organisations = 26.1%)** | 1. OIOS |
| | 2. UNFPA[2] |
| | 3. UNRWA |
| | 4. ICAO |
| | 5. IMO |
| | 6. UNESCO |
| | 7. WHO |
| | 8. WIPO |
| | 9. WMO |
| | 10. IAEA |
| | 11. IOM |
| | 12. OPCW |
| **Entities with Evaluation co-located with Programme Policy, Management, Planning and/or Monitoring Units (10 organisations = 21.7%)** | 1. UN-OCHA |
| | 2. UN-OHCHR |
| | 3. UN-ECA |
| | 4. UN-ECE |
| | 5. UN-ECLAC |
| | 6. UN-ESCAP |
| | 7. UN-ESCWA |
| | 8. UNAIDS |
| | 9. UNHCR |
| | 10. UNICEF |
| **Entities with Evaluation co-located with Research and/or Learning Units (2 organisations = 4.3%)** | 1. UN-DPI |
| | 2.UN-DPKO |
| **Entities with no dedicated evaluation units (3 organisations = 6.5%** | 1. UN-DESA |
| | 2. WTO |
| | 3. UN-DSS |

[2] UNFPA is in the process of reviewing its evaluation policy and the unit concerned might be separated from oversight functions as from 2013

# 3 ANNEX C: PERSONS CONSULTED (BY CLUSTERS)

| NAME | ORGANISATION | NAME | ORGANISATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CLUSTER 1: UNEG MEMBERS** | | | |
| **UNEG Heads and other members** | | | |
| Mark Pedersen | **DPKO** | Margareta de Goys | **UNIDO** |
| Robert Moore | **FAO** | Helen Wedgwood | **WFP** |
| Robert D. van den Berg | **GEF** | Sally Borrows | **WFP** |
| Ashwami K. Muthoo | **IFAD** | Jamie Watts | **WFP** |
| Guy Thijs | **ILO** | Thierry Rajaobelina | **WIPO** |
| Christophe Franzetti | **IOM** | Caroline Heider | **World Bank, (Observer)** |
| Miguel Jimenez-Pont | **ITC** | **Co-Chairs of TFs (other than UNEG Heads)** | |
| Susanne Frueh | **JIU (Observer)** | Barbara Toggler | **UNESCO / TF-ENW** |
| Sukai Prom-Jackson | **JIU** | Demetra Arapakos | **OIOS / TF-ENW** |
| Gerard Biraud | **JIU Inspector** | Flaminia Minelli | **OHCHR / TF- HR&GE** |
| Scott Green | **OCHA** | Shravanti Reddy | **UN WOMEN / TF-HR&GE** |
| Jennifer Worrell | **OHCHR** | Tullia Aiazzi | **FAO / TF-IE** |
| Deborah Rugg | **OIOS** | Caspar Merkle | **UN WOMEN / TF-IE** |
| Belen Sanz | **UN Women** | Inga Sniukaite | **UN WOMEN / TF-NEC** |
| Salil Panakadan | **UNAIDS** | Marco Segone | **UNICEF / TF-NEC** |
| Yuen Ching Ho | **UNCTAD** | Krishna Belbase | **UNICEF / TF-JE** |
| Indran Naidoo | **UNDP** | Rachel Bedouin | **FAO / TF-SEF** |
| Masahiro Igarashi | **UNDP** | Ram Babu Nepal | **OPCW / TF-SEF** |
| Zamira Eshmambetova | **UNECE** | Amir Piric | **UNESCO / TF-NS** |
| Catherine Haswell | **UNECE** | Jock Paul | **OCHA** |
| Segbedzi Norgbey | **UNEP** | **Current and former members of UNEG Bureau** | |
| Edgar Dante | **UNESCAP** | Masahiro Igarashi | **Executive Coordinator** |
| Bert Keuppens | **UNESCO** | Jin Zhang | **Programme Specialist** |
| Fabienne Lambert | **UNFPA** | Saraswathi Menon | **Former Chair** |
| Louis Charpentier | **UNFPA** | Juha Uitto | **Former Executive Coordinator** |
| Machiel Salomons | **UNHCR** | Nurul Alam | **Former Executive Coordinator** |
| Colin Kirk | **UNICEF** | Tina Tordjman-Nebe | **Former Programme Specialist** |
| | | Michelle Bo Weston | **Former Programme Specialist** |
| | | | |
| **CLUSTER 2: NON-UNEG EVAL. COMMUNITY** | | **CLUSTER 3: EVALUATION USERS** | |
| Soma De Silva | **President, International Organisation for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE)** | Carman Lapointe | **UN Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services** |
| Nick York | **Director of Country, Corporate, and Global Evaluations of the Independent Evaluation Group, The World Bank; Former** | Sharon Van Buerle | **Secretary, Fifth Committee and Committee for Programme and Coordination** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Chief Professional Officer for Evaluation, DFID** | | |
| Hemamala Hettige | **Director, Evaluation Division 2, ADB** | Debbie Landey | **Director, UN DOCO** |
| Ivory Yong-Prötzel | **Head, Operation Evaluation Division, EIB** | Gerald Daly | **DOCO** |
| John Mitchell | **Director, ALNAP** | Alexander Freese | **DOCO** |
| Niels Dabenstein | **Ex Chair of OECD/DAC evalnet and ret. Director of evaluation, DANIDA** | Arafat Jamal | **Chief, IASC Secretariat, Geneva** |
| Stefan Dahlgren | **Retired Director Evaluation SIDA** | Glockner, Matthew E | **State Department, USA** |
| Joakim Molander | **SIDA, former evaluation Director** | Ms. Berit Fladby | **Head of the UN section, MFA, Norway** |
| Dominique de Crombrugghe | **Head of evaluation department of MFA, Belgium** | Per Mostag | **Norway, MFA** |
| Henri Jorritsma | **Deputy director of the evaluation department of MoFA, Netherlands** | Ms. Tonje Lie Liebich | **Norwegian UN P. Mission, Rome** |
| Ted Kliest | **Facilitation of the Peer Reviews of UNEG** | Larbi Djacta | **Algeria (Group of 77)** |
| Josse Gillijns | **IFRC Director Evaluation** | Chris Stokes | **Australia** |
| Megan-Grace Kennedy-Chouane | **OECD/DAC Evalnet** | Claude Lemieux | **Canada** |
| Ian Davies | **Consultant** | Vincent Herlihy | **Ireland** |
| | | Yasuaky Momita | **Japan** |
| | | Susan Eckey | **Norway** |
| | | Ekaterina Fotina | **P. Mission Russian Fed.** |
| | | Dmitri S. Chumakov | **P. Mission, Russian Fed.** |
| | | Anna Evstigneeva | **Russian Fed. P. Mission** |
| | | Pio Wennubst | **P. Mission Switzerland** |
| | | Kate Gilmore | **UNFPA** |
| | | Lauren Landis | **WFP – Geneva Office** |
| | | Kevin Andrews | **UK** |
| | | Ed Schenkenberg van Mierop, | **Executive Director of the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA)** |

# 4 ANNEX D: KEY DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- ALNAP STRATEGY, 2008–2013, ALNAP, U.K.
- ALNAP Governance, Management and Membership, March 2012. ALNAP, U.K.
- ALNAP, Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria. An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies. March 2006, ODI, U.K.
- Atul Khare *et al.,* "The Change Plan: Proposals by the Change Management Team to the Secretary-General", New York, December 2011
- Bester and Lusthaus, "INDEPENDENT SYSTEM WIDE EVALUATION MECHANISM – Comprehensive review of the existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation of operational activities for development of the United Nations system mandated in Resolution 64/289: Final Report", March 2012
- General Assembly, "Triennial comprehensive review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system", document A/RES/62/208, 14 March 2008
- General Assembly, "Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system", document A/RES/67/226, 22 January 2013.
- Innovations for Scaling Impact and Keystone Accountability, "Next Generation Network Evaluation", June 2010
- Leeuw, F and Jos Vaessen, "NONIE: Guidance on Impact Evaluation Impact Evaluations And Development", World Bank 2009
- OECD DAC REVISION OF THE DAC SUBSIDIARY BODY MANDATES, DAC Meeting, 12 November 2012
- OECD DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, 2012
- OECD DAC NETWORK ON DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION, EVALUATING DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION SUMMARY OF KEY NORMS AND STANDARDS, SECOND EDITION, no date.
- Spitz and Muhith, "Report on the Review of Inter Agency Working Group on Evaluation", New York, 2 January 2001
- UN-AIDS, ASSESSMENT OF THE GLOBAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION REFERENCE GROUP, Final
- 16 November 2011
- UN-AIDS Monitoring & Evaluation Reference Group (MERG), Conclusions and Decisions, Glion, Switzerland, 20-21 November 2012
- UN-AIDS, 14th Meeting of the UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group, FINAL REPORT
- 8-10 February 2011 / Geneva, Switzerland
- UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES – UN-RIAS OPERATING MODE Update Adopted by UN-RIAS on 2 December 2010
- UNEG, "Evaluation Capacity in the UN System", 2012
- UNEG, "NONIE 2012 Meeting Report", April 2012
- UNEG, "Principles of Working Together, Foundation Document", May 2012 (revision)
- UNEG, "UNEG Secretariat report on the sixty fourth plenary session on system-wide coherence, informal consultations, 6 May 2010, New York", document UNEG/SYS(09-10)
- UNEG, "UNEG – Considerations in the Strengthening of UN System-Wide Evaluation", prepared by the UNEG High Level Panel on Coherence Report Working Group, March 2007
- UNEG, "United Nations Evaluation Group Evaluation Practice Exchange (EPE) 2012 – Report on Process and Lessons Learned", document UNEG/EPE/LL/(2012), 2012
- UN, "Independent Evaluation of Delivering as One", Evaluation Management Group, New York, June 2012

# 5    ANNEX E: EVALUATION MATRIX

| CRITERIA/ SUB-CRITERIA | MAIN QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED | DATA COLLECTION METHODS / DATA SOURCES |
|---|---|---|
| **1. RELEVANCE** | Are the strategies and approaches adopted by UNEG relevant to the needs of its members and other stakeholders? | |
| **1.1 Relevance of the strategies** | • Are the mission statement and strategic approach in the PoWT consistent with the expectation of members?<br>• Are the activities and approaches relevant to the realisation of UNEG's mission?<br>• Are activities aligned with the values and principles of the UN?<br>• How could UNEG become more relevant for all stakeholders?<br>• Have members developed a sense of ownership of UNEG? How does that show?<br>• Do you perceive UNEG as a vibrant and productive forum and network or more as an information exchange entity? | Interviews and group meetings<br>- Heads of Evaluation Units of member organisations<br>- Current and past members of the UNEG Bureau<br>- Key members of senior management of the UN , including Change Management Team (UN-CMT), Executive Boards, etc<br>- Key representatives of other evaluation networks |
| **1.2 Relevance of the approaches** | • Are approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve planned outcomes?<br>• Do they follow known good practices in other similar networks? | Survey / questionnaire for members<br><br>Document reviews and analysis<br>- PoWT, UNEG Annual Reports, Minutes, Executive Coordinator Reports |
| **2. EFFECTIVENESS** | Did UNEG accomplish its intended objectives and planned results? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the network? What are the unexpected results it yielded? Did UNEG promote innovative activities or approaches? Should it continue in the same direction or should its main tenets be reviewed? | |
| **2.1 Progress toward achieving strategic objectives** | • Did UNEG define clear and achievable results or outcomes and were activities developed in response to those outcomes?<br>• Did UNEG activities and products contribute to progress toward the stated mission?<br>• To what extent has UNEG been able to coordinate TF's, OCs, members effectively in order to achieve its mission?<br>• Have members improved their own evaluation function and work and are approaches based on services and products emanating from UNEG?<br>• What are the normative instruments developed by UNEG that have been most useful to its members?<br>• Have norms and guidelines of UNEG helped to push forward support from senior management to improve and increase support for evaluation in terms of policy and resources?<br>• To what degree do members hold shared values?<br>• Are there any structural and governance issues impeding UNEG's effectiveness?<br>• Is communication within UNEG and with the members adequate?<br>• To what extent has UNEG contributed to | Interviews with<br>- members and other stakeholders<br>- current and past members of the Bureau<br>- UNDG, IASC, UN-CMT<br>- SWOT<br><br>Survey / questionnaire for members<br><br>Document reviews and analysis<br>- Mandates of Task Forces<br>- Annual Reports<br>- UNEG presentations to Senior Management<br>- Minutes, Executive Coordinator Reports<br><br><br>- Interviews with<br>- members and other stakeholders<br>- current and past members of the |

| | building capacity across its membership and what capacity and knowledge has been built for what purpose? | - Bureau<br>- co-Chairs of TF and OC<br>- Survey |
|---|---|---|
| **2.2 Adapting to change** | • Have there been unexpected and unintended results from activities and approaches? How have they been anticipated and managed?<br>• How did UNEG react to unforeseen requests or changes in the environment from within its membership, from the UN or from other networks or member states?<br>• Is UNEG perceived as promoting innovative and creative approaches? Examples? | |
| **3.  Efficiency** | How well have the work plans, working methods and internal governance structures of UNEG contributed to achieving expected results? | |
| **3.1 Managerial efficiency** | • Have activities been implemented within deadlines and costs estimates?<br>• When needed, have the Bureau and/or co-Chairs of Task Forces been able to take prompt and appropriate corrective action?<br>• Has there been adequate monitoring and evaluation of the work of Task Forces and Organising Committees? With what results? | Interviews with<br>- members and other stakeholders<br>- current and past members of the Bureau<br>- co-Chairs of TF and OC<br>- Head, UNDP Evaluation Office<br><br>Survey / questionnaire for members |
| **3.2 Internal Governance** | • Are the mandates and TOR of the AGM, the Bureau and the Secretariat designed to maximise efficiency?<br>• Are decision-making processes at the AGM, within the Bureau and the Coordinating Committee timely and effective?<br>• Did UNEG succeed in ensuring adequate participation and interaction among its members? Did this effort towards inclusiveness have a possible negative impact on efficiency?<br>• Is the administrative backup provided by UNDP adequate? Is it perceived as an undue burden by UNDP itself or as a threat to UNEG's independence by other entities? | Review of PoWT, in particular the TOR for the Chair, vice-Chair, Executive Coordinator and Secretariat. Analysis of the evolution of these roles since 2004 |
| **4.  Sustainability** | Are the structures and resources of UNEG supporting the attainment of desired results and can they continue to do so? | |
| **4.1 Adequacy of human and financial resources** | • Does UNEG benefit from sufficient resources to ensure that it achieves its mission?<br>• Can UNEG adopt work plans and budgets on the basis of predictable resources?<br>• If not, what corrective measures could be envisaged? | Review of financial reports, variations in budgets and expenditure, balance between reliance on cash versus in-kind contributions and the relative weight of individual members as contributors |
| **4.2 Threats to sustainability** | • What issues emerged over the years that could either be a threat or a help to the sustainability of the mission of UNEG?<br>• Is UNEG perceived as a contributor to change within the UN or as a factor of resistance? | Survey / questionnaire for members<br>SWOT<br>Interviews with key members of the various "clusters" |
| **5.  Positioning and partnerships** | How has UNEG positioned itself within the broader evaluation community? What partnership has it developed with other evaluation networks?<br>What is the contribution of UNEG to the objectives and work of the UN, including the reform process? | |
| **5.1 Networking** | • How does UNEG contribute to and benefit from its role as observer in OECD/DAC | Interviews and group meetings with |

| outside the UN | Evaluation Network and in ECG, and (if any) its relationship with IOCE and regional evaluation associations?<br>• How cohesive is the network? | - Current and past members of the UNEG Bureau<br>- Key members of senior management of the UN , including Change Management Team (UN-CMT), Executive Boards, etc<br>- Key representatives of other evaluation networks<br><br>Survey with cluster II ( tentative)<br><br>Document review and analysis<br>- Annual reports<br>- Presentations by UNEG to UN decision-making bodies |
|---|---|---|
| **5.2 Partnerships and cooperation within the UN** | • How effective is the relationship between UNEG and other groups of the UN such as UNDG and IASC?<br>• How does UNEG contribute to decision-making within the UN through interaction with Executive Committees, ECOSOC and other UN entities?<br>• What is the contribution of UNEG to major UN objectives such as the MDG, gender equality, and reforms such as Working as One, etc?<br>• Is UNEG adapting to its context and ongoing or planned reforms? | |

# 6 ANNEX F: RESULTS OF KEY QUESTIONS UNEG ASSESSMENT 2004 -2012

| Question 7: How do you rate UNEG's contribution to the evaluation capacity of your organization (in relationship to your organization's legislative body; programme development; mandates and approval of resources? ( UNEG Heads only) | Very useful | Somewhat useful | Not useful | No opinion | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enhancing support from legislative bodies | 6 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 27 |
| Facilitating Programming of Evaluations and work plans | 2 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 27 |
| Fostering learning | 9 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 27 |
| Helping in securing resources | 2 | 5 | 19 | 1 | 27 |

| Question 8: UNEG financial situation and status. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. ( UNEG Heads only) | Agree | Do not agree | No Opinion | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| UNEG should continue to function mainly on the basis of voluntary and ad hoc contributions by members | 16 | 7 | 4 | 27 |
| UNEG should develop a more predictable resource base, for instance by agreeing on guidelines for the amount of voluntary contributions | 14 | 9 | 4 | 27 |
| UNEG should collectively solicit organizations - at the appropriate level - to consider budgeting (or making a budget request for) an agreed amount of contributions to UNEG | 12 | 13 | 2 | 27 |
| UNEG should strengthen its efforts to seek financial support from bilateral donors or intergovernmental institutions | 18 | 5 | 4 | 27 |
| UNEG should permit observer status to more outside professional associations and networks | 13 | 8 | 6 | 27 |

| Question 9: Among the following roles of UNEG, which have been particularly relevant to your own needs and objectives and those of your evaluation unit or organisation? All respondents | Very relevant | Partly relevant | Not relevant | No opinion | Not applic able | Response Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Encourage the adoption of common norms and standards for UN evaluation | 94 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 109 |
| Develop and support common positions on evaluation issues | 54 | 42 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 109 |
| Strengthen the competence of UN evaluation staff | 47 | 42 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 109 |
| Serve as a forum enabling networking among members | 64 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 109 |
| Facilitate mutual support and learning through the exchange of knowledge and | 57 | 43 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 109 |

| best practices | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Promote innovation and joint initiatives | 38 | 50 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 109 |
| Encourage the use of evaluation for learning, decision-making and accountability | 34 | 43 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 109 |
| Contribute to the independence of evaluation as a practice in UN organisations | 49 | 43 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 109 |
| Support member countries in building national evaluation capacity | 13 | 26 | 42 | 16 | 12 | 109 |
| Facilitate partnerships and capacity development through networking beyond the UN | 21 | 38 | 35 | 13 | 2 | 109 |
| Work in project format on specific topics | 7 | 52 | 26 | 19 | 5 | 109 |

| Question 10: Among the following UNEG products and services, which have been most useful to your work and that of your unit or organisation? All respondents | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Very useful** | **Partly useful** | **Not useful** | **No opinion** | **Not applic able** | **Response Count** |
| The Annual General Meetings (AGM) | 24 | 54 | 12 | 13 | 6 | 109 |
| The Evaluation Practice Exchange (EPE) Seminars | 32 | 48 | 7 | 17 | 5 | 109 |
| The organisation of Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation meetings (NONIE) | 9 | 44 | 18 | 30 | 8 | 109 |
| Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN | 96 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| UNEG ethical guidelines and code of conduct | 64 | 37 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 109 |
| Core competencies for Heads of Evaluation Units and core competencies for evaluators in the UN | 35 | 40 | 10 | 20 | 4 | 109 |
| National Evaluation Capacity Development: Practical tips on how to strengthen National Evaluation Systems | 13 | 26 | 25 | 30 | 15 | 109 |
| Evaluation Capacity in the UN System | 25 | 44 | 17 | 18 | 5 | 109 |
| Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – towards UNEG guidance | 37 | 47 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 109 |
| Quality checklists for evaluation terms of reference, inception reports and evaluation reports | 56 | 31 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 109 |
| Good Practice Guidelines for Follow up to Evaluations | 44 | 35 | 12 | 18 | 0 | 109 |
| Country evaluability studies and support to the Independent Evaluation of Delivering as One | 14 | 36 | 20 | 30 | 9 | 109 |
| Support to the development of UNDAF evaluations and results-based management evaluations | 13 | 37 | 20 | 28 | 11 | 109 |
| Contribution to discussions on a System Wide Evaluation mechanism | 24 | 41 | 21 | 17 | 6 | 109 |

| Question 11: Please indicate whether you personally consider that the following areas of work will continue to be relevant to your own work and that of your unit or organisation in future. All respondents | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Relevant | Less relevant to my unit | No opinion | Response Count |
| Evaluation of normative work | 91 | 16 | 2 | 109 |
| Human Rights and Gender Equality | 69 | 40 | 0 | 109 |
| Impact Evaluation | 93 | 16 | 0 | 109 |
| Strengthening National Evaluation Capacity | 45 | 59 | 5 | 109 |
| Joint Evaluations | 72 | 34 | 3 | 109 |
| Strengthening of the Evaluation Function | 97 | 11 | 1 | 109 |
| Norms and Standards | 99 | 8 | 2 | 109 |
| Peer Reviews | 73 | 29 | 7 | 109 |
| Knowledge Management | 77 | 30 | 2 | 109 |
| Cooperation with non-UN evaluation networks or groups | 52 | 51 | 6 | 109 |
| Exchange of practice among UN evaluators | 90 | 16 | 3 | 109 |

| Question 13: Clarity of roles: please indicate how clear the roles are of the different UNEG bodies that constitute the governance and management of UNEG. All respondents | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Role is clear | Role is clear but should be revised | Role is not clear and should be revised | No opinion | Response Count |
| The Annual General Meeting | 45 | 23 | 13 | 26 | 107 |
| The Chair/Vice-Chair of UNEG | 43 | 18 | 16 | 30 | 107 |
| The Executive Coordinator/ and the Secretariat | 44 | 14 | 16 | 33 | 107 |
| The Coordinating Committee | 25 | 12 | 25 | 45 | 107 |

| Question 14: Decision-making process: please provide us with your opinion of the decision making processes in UNEG. All respondents | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Agree | Do not agree | No opinion | Response Count |
| Decisions taken by the AGM are results oriented and clarify implementing responsibilities, time-frames and accountability | 30 | 39 | 37 | 106 |
| There is an effective mechanism ( the Coordination Committee) to monitor the implementation of decisions between AGMs | 17 | 41 | 49 | 107 |
| Organisations with smaller human and financial resources for evaluation can participate in decision-making and can contribute as effectively as other members. | 47 | 29 | 31 | 107 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Larger organisations and those contributing financially to UNEG should have a greater say in the direction of the network | 19 | 61 | 27 | 107 |
| At each AGM, the Bureau of UNEG reports in a satisfactory manner on the implementation of past decisions | 41 | 15 | 51 | 107 |
| The Bureau of UNEG reports candidly on problems arising and issues, even contentious ones | 24 | 25 | 57 | 106 |
| The Task Forces report according to schedule and are held responsible by the AGM | 27 | 39 | 40 | 106 |

| Question 15: Is the current format of UNEG events (AGM, Seminars, networks, taskforces, use of the website) the best mode of operating and delivering on the intended results? All respondents | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Adequate** | **Inadequate** | **No opinion** | **Response Count** |
| AGM | 48 | 29 | 30 | 107 |
| Seminars/EPE | 59 | 20 | 28 | 107 |
| Task Forces | 40 | 43 | 24 | 107 |
| Website | 56 | 27 | 24 | 107 |

# 7 ANNEX G: SWOT RESULTS FROM GENEVA AND NEW YORK

| Useful in achieving UNEG's mission | Geneva | Impeding achieving UNEG's mission | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **STRENGHTS** | | **WEAKNESSES** | |
| Guidance | 5 | Institutional Identify and Governance | 6 |
| Knowledge Sharing | 5 | AGM and Task forces | 3 |
| Strengthening of the evaluation function | 2 | Funding | 0 |
| Norms and Standards | 2 | Products and Services | 0 |
| Diversity | 0 | | |
| Governance | 0 | | |
| Total | 14 | Total | 9 |
| **OPPORTUNITIES** | | **THREATS** | |
| Strengthening Technical support and training | 10 | Governance | 7 |
| Stronger links outside UN | 2 | Large versus small agencies | 2 |
| Alternative sources of funding | 0 | Politics | 1 |
| More sharing | 0 | Funding | 0 |
| | | Outreach | |
| Total | 12 | Total | 10 |

Agencies which participated (please note that some agencies had several participants)
  1- UNECE
  2- ILO
  3- IOM
  4- ITC
  5- OHCHR
  6- UNAIDS
  7- UNCTAD
  8- WIPO
  9- JIU

| Useful in achieving UNEG's mission | New York | Impeding achieving UNEG's mission | |
|---|---|---|---|
| STRENGHTS | | WEAKNESSES | |
| Norms and Standards as a reference framework | 4 | Vision and Strategy/ Role | 4 |
| Visibility of evaluation within the UN system | 3 | Concerns about weak governance and weak management and operational procedures | 3 |
| Support professionalization | 0 | Visibility/outside perception | 1 |
| Active Community of Practice | 0 | M&E of UNEG and impact and use | 1 |
| Autonomous entity | 0 | Field relevance | 1 |
| | | Diversity | 0 |
| | | Time constraints | 0 |
| | | Resources constraints | 0 |
| | | Task Force Issues | 0 |
| | | Capacity Building | 0 |
| Total | 7 | Total | 10 |
| OPPORTUNTIES | | THREATS | |
| Increasing legitimacy and relevance | 3 | Commitment and Sustainability | 3 |
| Platform for enhanced Collaboration/Joint work and advancing Knowledge | 3 | Decision making process | 2 |
| UNEG should be a stronger advocate for evaluation | 2 | Political Threats | 1 |
| Strengthen the evaluation function at country level | 1 | Financial and Funding | 1 |
| Rethink UNEG's role | 1 | Membership | |
| | | Interaction with other Oversight function | |
| | | Management Interaction | |
| Total | 10 | Total | 7 |

Agencies which participated (please note that some agencies had several participants)
1- DPKO
2- OCHA
3- OIOS
4- UNCDF
5- UNFPA
6- UNICEF
7- UN Women
8- UNEG Secretariat

# 8    ANNEX H: BENCHMARKING UNEG AGAINST OTHER NETWORKS

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) | **NATURE of the NETWORK** | Development Assistance Committee evaluation network (DAC EvalNet) | The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) | United Nations Representatives Of Internal Audit Services (UN RIAS) | UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group (MERG) |
| Brings together all heads of evaluations in UN agencies | **Focus** | Development oriented and based on the objectives of the OECD/DAC | Humanitarian oriented | Brings together all UN auditors together | Brings all M&E specialists in UN AIDS together |
| UNEG's mission is to promote the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function and evaluation across the UN system and to promote the visibility and advocate the importance of evaluation for learning, decision making and accountability.

UNEG has no strategy | **Objectives and/or Mission** | Evalnet works to increase the effectiveness of international development programmes by supporting robust, informed and independent evaluation. This unique body brings together evaluation managers and specialists from development agencies of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and multilateral development institutions. | ALNAP is a learning network that supports the humanitarian sector to improve humanitarian performance through learning, peer-to-peer sharing and research.

ALNAP uses the broad range of experience and expertise within its membership to produce tools and analysis relevant and accessible to the humanitarian sector as a whole.

Its vision and mission is included in the strategy | The UN-RIAS is concerned with strengthening internal auditing practices and professionalism by providing a forum for development of methodologies and their related innovation, promoting and supporting independence, collaboration and common positions of its members to add value to their organizations. Adopting common professional positions and providing, as necessary, information and advice to other UN bodies (such as the CEB, HLCM, UNDG) on audit-related matters. Coordinating and harmonizing internal | MERG redefined its mission in 2012 and it is now an independent body of experts that advises UNAIDS and its partners on priority M&E issues relevant for policy and program decision making. The MERG thereby assists UNAIDS in its organizational mandate as the global leader and unifier of the response, by:
– ensuring coherence in M&E of HIV/AIDS response across stakeholders
– analyzing evidence for M&E in a rapidly changing global environment
– identifying gaps in M&E that need to be addressed |

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|------|----------|------------------|-------|---------|------|
| | | | | audit activities and processes between UN-RIAS members where necessary | as a priority – leading M&E thinking related to HIV, within the wider health and development context |
| UNEG considers section 2 of PoWT as their strategy | **Strategy** | The DAC EvalNet is part of the DAC strategy and had no additional strategy. It has annual work programmes which are approved by the Board<br><br>Its key elements are:<br>✓ Sharing experiences and peer learning<br>✓ Facilitating Collaboration and joint evaluations<br>✓ Developing Norms and Guidance<br>✓ Management and linking to policy communications | ALNAP's Strategy includes<br>✓ Vision, mandate, mission and values<br>✓ The strategic context<br>✓ Operational background<br>✓ Strategic objectives, 2008–2013<br>✓ Monitoring and learning<br><br>The strategy covers a time span of 5 years | UN-RIAS has a yearly work plan which is strategic in nature. | MERG has no strategy. The MERG has the following functions:<br>(1) to set international standards and norms that will facilitate coordination;<br>(2) to review and endorse policies, standards and tools;<br>(3) to coordinate the M&E agenda and convene ad-hoc Technical Working Groups (TWGs), as needed; and,<br>(4) to share M&E-relevant information. |
| No formal mandate | **Mandate** | Part of the OECD DAC mandate which runs until 2014. It is currently discussing a new mandate | | UN RIAS has no formal mandate. In 2008 a letter of understanding was drafted between the UN RIAS and the Chief of the Executive Board and the HLCM | No formal mandate. Mandate comes from UNAIDS |
| Principles of Working Together exist since 2007 and have been updated three times (2009, 2011, 2012) | **Founding document** | Meeting of OECD DAC High level Ministerial meeting in 1983 expressed concerns about the results of AID. | Guide for Humanitarian Principles based on OECD DAC evaluation criteria and ALNAP Governance and Management | Principles are laid down in a Modus Operandi UN RIAS which is reviewed every year and which title was changed in 2010 to | Originates in the UN AIDS Programme Coordination Board 1997 and was transformed to MERG in 1998 and renewed its |

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | document. | Operating Mode. | mission in 2012. |
| UNEG membership is institutional and is open to the units with the main responsibility for evaluation in each UN organisation Such units should have, or aspire to have, the required professional competence, experience and responsibility for evaluation as defined by the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The independent evaluation units of international organizations, which carry out a major part of their work through funds provided to the UN system, may also be members of UNEG. Each of these units will be represented by the unit head who will lead the organizations participation and voting in UNEG. These unit heads will be collectively referred to as "UNEG Heads". | **Membership & Fees** | All OECD DAC members are member (total 34) and the number of members is expected to increase. Members contribute to OECD DAC based on a formula. No additional fees. | Members are key humanitarian organisations and experts from across the humanitarian sector: donors, NGOs, the Red Cross/Crescent, the UN, independents and academics.<br><br>ALNAP consists of Full Members and Observer Members. The number of Full Members is limited to 100. Most Full Members are organisations and nominate a representative to be the contact between the organisation and ALNAP. The Full Membership also includes a number of independent experts.<br><br>Observer Members are individuals or organisations demonstrating an interest in issues of accountability, quality and learning in the humanitarian sector. There are currently 74 full members and observer | Membership is open to:<br><br>Internal Audit Services (IAS) of the UN, UN Funds and Programmes, UN Specialized Agencies, the IAEA and organizations institutionally related to the UN: CTBTO and OPCW.<br><br>Membership is organizational. Organizations are normally represented by the most senior officer heading the Internal Audit function of the entity. An Audit Committee member cannot represent the organization which he/she oversees.  Observer status is open to: Other IAS of non UN-RIAS but Plenary RIAS members or observers.<br><br>Entities that have programmatic/operational relationship with the members of the UN-RIAS: the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU); the United Nations Board of Auditors (BoA); the Panel of External | The MERG membership is upon personal invitation and includes: (a) M&E Directors or senior-level M&E Focal Points from major bi- and multi-lateral agencies with substantial involvement in M&E; (b) representatives from national governments; (c) recognized technical M&E experts, and, (d) representatives from civil society organisations. The Chairs of the Regional M&E Working Groups are members of the MERG. Potential additional members may be suggested by PCB members and by Member States for consideration by the MERG Chair.<br>No fee. |

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Invitations to contribute to UNEG financially and in kind. In practice less than 50% have ever contributed. | | | members are unlimited and observer membership is free. Full members pay a fee dependent on a formula. | Auditors (PEA) of the UN, the Specialized Agencies and the IAEA; the Internal Audit Service of the European Commission (IA-EC).<br>New UN-RIAS participants (members and observers) may be admitted subject to certain conditions. No membership fee. | |
| UNEG Norms and Standards 2005 | **Norms and Standards** | A '**Normative Framework'** which consists of<br>✓ Principles for evaluating;<br>✓ Glossary;<br>✓ Quality Standards for evaluations and<br>✓ Summary of Key Norms and Standards including peer review tool and criteria definitions | Guide to evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD- DAC criteria | Operational Mode. Works with international audit standards. | MERG has a normative document |
| Specific guidance for types of evaluations, topics such as gender and human rights and quality standards. | **Guidance documents** | Specific Guidance on<br>✓ Joint evaluations<br>✓ Conflict and Fragility<br>✓ Impact evaluations ( NONIE)<br>✓ Joint work<br>✓ Studies on member systems<br>✓ Budget Support Evaluation<br>✓ Paris declaration | ✓ Guide to Real Time Evaluations<br>✓ The Quality Pro Forma as a tool for assessing<br>✓ Lessons<br>✓ Evaluation guides<br>✓ Studies<br>✓ Guides and training materials<br>✓ Evaluation guides | UN RIAS developed 'Three Position Papers' which guide the network on topics. The number of topics is limited per year and depends on how the profession and its environment evolve.<br><br>General UN-RIAS common positions have to be | Specific Guidance on<br>✓ Indicator Standards<br>✓ M&E Assessment Tool Working<br>✓ MERG 12 Components<br>✓ M&E System Assessment - Guidelines<br>✓ MERG 12 Components M&E System Strengthening Tool |

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | evaluation<br>✓ Capacity Development | ✓ Evaluating Humanitarian Action<br>✓ Real-time Evaluations of Humanitarian Action<br>✓ Quality Pro Forma<br>✓ Evaluation training material<br>✓ Protection Guide<br>✓ Participation Handbook<br>✓ Food Distribution Guide | agreed by all UN-RIAS members; if not, only those UN-RIAS organizations which agree will be mentioned. Significant decisions should preferably be tabled for consideration at the Annual UN-RIAS meeting, and if not feasible, by email. | ✓ MERG Guidance HIV Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Building<br>✓ MERG Guidance on developing Terms of Reference for HIV Prevention Evaluation<br>✓ MERG Planning Tool for Developing a Digital Library for Monitoring and Evaluation Resources<br>✓ Monitoring and Evaluation Glossary Final Working Draft<br>✓ Organizing Framework for a Functioning National HIV Monitoring and Evaluation System<br>✓ Scoring Template for use with the Indicator Standards and Assessment Tool |
| EPE seminars before the AGM, Webinars, occasional training | **Learning and Training** | 'Evaluation Insights' are informal working papers, designed to highlight emerging findings and relevant policy messages from evaluation. This series is part of the Network's ongoing effort to actively support the use of evaluative evidence | ALNAP' developed training modules as a way of sharing knowledge and good practice identified through its research activities. The modules were updated in 2003 and 2007. The material is available to all free of charge, to aid those | UN RIAS: part of the yearly meeting (face to face) also covers training and additional training within working groups as needs evolve and participants organised training open to members. | Training provided to UN staff and nationals staff at international, regional and national level. |

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | in development policy making and debate. He network raises awareness of training offered elsewhere. | providing courses on the evaluation of humanitarian action.<br>✓ Lessons papers<br>✓ Working papers<br>✓ Innovations Case Studies<br>✓ Evaluative Reports Database (ERD)<br>✓ Bulletin archive | | |
| Website<br>Mailing list | **Communication** | Bi monthly newsletter to about 1000 people. Mailing list. Evaluation Insights | Website, including updates through email. Through website ALNAP can reach a large group and challenge is:<br>1. how to maintain focus and<br>2. how to consolidate<br>3. how to manage ALNAP produces status reports on humanitarian performance | Website for members only | Has its own website |
| | **GOVERNANCE and MANAGEMENT** | | | | |
| Chair and Vice Chair. The Annual General meeting brings all UNEG members together. One vote one member.<br>The Coordinating Committee (CC) is composed of the full Bureau, the member | **Meetings and decision-making** | Chair, two Vice Chairs and the Bureau.<br><br>Meets on average every 9 months with all members. General meeting is not too formal and agenda prepared by Secretariat. | The Steering Committee functions as ALNAP's quasi-executive body and is mandated to act on behalf of all Full Members. The purpose of the Steering Committee is to determine the direction and | UN-RIAS – decision making process: one member – one vote. Observers have no voting rights. Compliance with decisions is voluntary.<br><br>There should be at least one face-to-face UN-RIAS | The MERG Executive Council shall meet at least once a year in conjunction with the MERG meeting; additional meetings may be scheduled if the need arises. In addition to the MERG members, invited guests may participate in |

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| hosting the next AGM, representatives of each Task Force and any other members as decided by the AGM in the interest of representation of the membership at large. | | Outsiders can attend and be invited. | development of ALNAP in accordance with the views and priorities of the different constituent groups in the membership. Steering Committee decisions are therefore informed by discussions and priorities with ALNAP Full Member representatives. Each Steering Committee member is mandated to represent the views of his/her constituent grouping[3]. Decisions are taken on the basis of consensus. ALNAP's steering committee consists of eight Full Member representatives. Each committee member represents one of the ALNAP membership groupings. The Steering Committee is composed of eight Full Members representatives plus the | meeting a year – usually but not necessarily coupled with the Plenary RIAS meeting. (Plenary has larger membership than UN RIAS). At the Plenary meeting UN RIAS has a closed UN RIAS meeting. Email exchange, video/ telephone conferences throughout the year: on average every 8 weeks. The UN-RIAS Chair and Vice Chairs are elected by UN-RIAS members present at the Annual UN-RIAS Meeting until the next Annual UN-RIAS Meeting, or otherwise decided based on consensus by the UN-RIAS members present at a virtual UN-RIAS meeting prior to the next Annual UN-RIAS meeting. Responsibilities of both are outlines in the Operating Mode. Liaises with other UN- | the meeting as deemed appropriate to support the MERG agenda. The ad-hoc TWGs shall meet twice a year, and as often as deemed necessary. In addition, electronic discussion and regular conference calls will be used in support of the TWG work plan implementation. A MERG Executive Council consisting of the M&E directors or senior-level M&E Focal Points of the top-ten funders of M&E support shall be established. The Executive Council will focus on implementation issues related to M&E norms and guidance endorsed by the MERG. |

[3] Currently there are 5 constituent groups comprising i) Donor group; ii) UN group; iii) NGO group including network/umbrella organisations iv); Research institutes/consultants and (v) Red Cross/Red Crescent.

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Steering Committee Chair (nine members total). To ensure balanced representation of the different constituent groups are selected in the SC. | RIAS Working Group (WG) Chairs throughout the year. | |
| **Task Forces** are the principal mechanism for UNEG to develop its products and implement the work programme approved at each AGM. No limit no clear rules of the game re outputs; membership, etc. | **Working Modalities** | **Task Teams** undertake work on themes and particular issues and the Bureau makes sure that their work is endorsed and put on the general meeting's agenda. Once approved it is chaired with members and if applicable with the public. | ALNAP has a many products and services which is supported and managed by the Secretariat ( 7 members)<br><br>Full members to manage the conception, production and dissemination of key ALNAP products such as the *State of the Humanitarian System reports* and *Lessons Papers*. | UN-RIAS Working Groups (WG) may be set up as needed, either at the Annual UN-RIAS meeting or during VMs, as required. A WG should meet the following conditions:<br><br>Clear membership and Chairperson.<br><br>Deadlines and deliverables agreed upon by the UN-RIAS members.<br><br>Output prepared by the WG members.<br><br>The WG Chairperson liaises as necessary with the UN-RIAS Vice-Chair.<br><br>The WG Chairperson reports on WG output at the VMs throughout the year, and at the Annual Meeting if necessary. | MERG has an Indicator Working Group, an Evidence and Evaluation Task Team and an Integration Task team, Each TWG shall develop a work plan for the upcoming year including key tasks, products, and timeline. The membership of the TWG is not representational, but shall be limited in numbers (maximum 5 members) and consist of recognized technical experts. The Chair of the TWG is selected from the MERG membership. |

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|------|----------|------------------|-------|---------|------|
| The Secretariat consists of one full time staff member and an executive coordinator for about 20%. Both are paid for by UNDP. In addition it has a The Coordination Committee (CC) supports the Chair, vice-Chair and Executive Coordinator of UNEG in facilitating and coordinating the ongoing work of UNEG in line with decisions taken at the AGM. The CC is presided over by the Chair of UNEG and is representative of the diversity of the UNEG membership. It comprises | **Secretariat / Support functions** | Has a small Secretariat consisting of two full time staff and a secretary. They also provide some services to other parts of the DAC. | The Secretariat is hosted by the Overseas Development Institute in London. ODI provides ALNAP with a suitably 'neutral' location from which to serve its diverse membership; ease of access to information flows, research and debates within the humanitarian sector; and the institutional support of an established organisation. The key role of the ALNAP Secretariat is to realise the ALNAP Strategy) though implementation of annual work plans. All activities are developed by the Secretariat (7 members) with guidance from the Steering Committee and consultation with the Full Members. Currently, Secretariat Staff consist of a Director; Head of Research and Communications; Evaluation, Learning and Accountability Officer; Research and Innovations | Secretarial Support (incl. maintaining the list of UN-RIAS Organizations, whichever their status): Assistance to be provided on a rotational basis, in principle by the UN-RIAS Chair and/or Vice-Chair, although other UN-RIAS members may provide such support. | The MERG Secretariat shall be responsible for the agenda which shall include a progress report on the activities identified in the yearly work plan, discussion of the challenges encountered, and the suggested ways forward. The UNAIDS Secretariat/Evaluation Division will appoint a contractor as the MERG Secretariat to assist in the logistical aspects of the maintenance of the MERG and the MERG meeting. Chair and assistance UNAids |

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Officer; Network and Communications Officer; Programme Officer and Communications Officer (part-time). The ALNAP Director is responsible for the management of the Secretariat. | | |
| Since 2011, the Chair, Vice-Chair, Executive Coordinator and the Professional Assistant have formed a "Bureau" that meets regularly to provide support to the Chair. | Bureau | Consists of the chair and vice chairs and is of an informal nature. Secretariat prepares their meeting based on what evolves in the DAC. | Does not exist. It only has the Secretariat | Does not exist. Virtual meetings every 8 weeks with all members make a Bureau unnecessary | Does not exist |
| UNEG depends on the contributions, financial and in kind, made or mobilised by its membership. All members are therefore expected and encouraged to contribute to joint activities, the Secretariat and the AGM. The contributions are irregular. | Resources/ Funding | Evalnet is part of the DAC Group and the budget has 2 parts:<br><br>Membership fees in OECD general budget depend on the size of the country and additional voluntary contribution in addition to the standard. The budget for EvalNet includes meetings, | Financial contributions [4]<br><br>ALNAP's funding contributions are based on a formula. | Secretarial Support (incl. maintaining the list of UN-RIAS Organizations, whichever their status): Assistance to be provided on a rotational basis. | A small operating budget is made available by the UNAIDS Secretariat (UNAIDS/PCB) each year to cover the costs of the MERG meeting. Modest additional resources are made available by the UNAIDS Secretariat Evaluation Division to support selected TWG activities. Additional support may be sought, as needed, from agencies |

---

[4] Financial contributions are suggested as a guide only and are currently under review by the ALNAP Steering Committee.

| UNEG | FUNCTION | OECD DAC Evalnet | ALNAP | UN-RIAS | MERG |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | travel, translation, salaries. Joint evaluations, for example, are conducted through pooling and cost sharing. | | | that are part of the MERG Executive Council. |
| Website, including job openings and consultancies. Rosters of consultants for UNEG members to consult. | OTHER SALIENT POINTS/ FEATURES | OECD DAC donors are all development oriented. Very informal and strong leadership and long term presence by Head of Secretariat. Also strong facilitation role for collaboration among members. Hands on approach. Strong sense of solidarity and supporting each other. | It posts job opening and consultancies and organisations can submit these. Evaluation Community is not dominant in ALNAP. ALNAP has a community of practice to discuss these issues so they can share learning across the sector and not only across the members.<br><br>ALNAP can manage and implement the strategy due to a strong Secretariat.<br><br>ALNAP often perceived as a public good with a strong learning focus. | UN RIAS has a work plan with normative, operational and administrative activities. These alter every year. Meetings every 8 weeks by phone to monitor progress of the activities. This permits flexibility, acceleration and swift closure if activities have ended. Those that are not urgent are put in a 'Parking Pack'. UN RIAS has no resources. All is voluntary. Operating Mode is revisited every year with tough negotiations. | Re evaluation each 5 years. Executive council takes recommendations seriously which helps move into action and mobilises resources. Each annual meetings guest speakers are invited. Coordination meetings with civil society, national representatives, academia, agencies and donors covering the HIV-AIDS landscape leading to effective coordination and less overlap and duplication |

# 9 ANNEX I: UNEG PRODUCTS DOWNLOADED

| Year | Title | Downloads from website |
|------|-------|------------------------|
| **A. Foundation, normative and basic governance documents** | | |
| 2012 | UNEG EPE Principles | 170 |
| 2008 | UNEG Core Competencies for Heads of Evaluation Offices in the United Nations | 1218 |
| | Core Competencies for Evaluators of the UN System | 1923 |
| | UNEG Ethical Guidelines | 3872 |
| | UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system | 3526 |
| 2007 | UNEG Principles of Working Together (amended at 2009, 2011 and 2012 AGMs) | 1450 |
| 2005 | Standards for Evaluation in the UN System | 36712 |
| | Norms for Evaluation in the UN System | 33396 |
| **B. Guidance documents / Handbooks** | | |
| 2012 | National Evaluation Capacity Development: Practical tips on how to strengthen National Evaluation Systems | 1410 |
| | Evaluation Capacity in the UN System | 338 |
| | National Evaluation Capacity Development: Practical tips on how to strengthen National Evaluation Systems (A Report for the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Task Force on National Evaluation Capacity Development) | 1374 |
| | UNEG Brochure | 238 |
| 2011 | Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – towards UNEG guidance | 10889 |
| | UNEG Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function of UN organizations | 938 |
| | Concept note on possible roles for UNEG members in national Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) | 10 |
| 2010 | Good Practice Guidelines for Follow up to Evaluations | 2841 |
| | UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports | 2777 |
| | UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports | 2644 |
| | Distinctiveness of the Evaluation Function | 44 |
| 2008 | UNEG Job Description for Evaluators in the UN System, Senior Evaluation Officer, P5 | 1230 |
| | UNEG Job Description for Evaluators in the UN System , Intermediate Evaluation Officer, P4 | 1136 |
| | UNEG Job Description for Evaluators in the UN System, Evaluation Officer, P3 | 749 |
| | UNEG Job Description for Evaluators in the UN System , Associate Evaluation Officer P1-P2 | 1049 |
| 2007 | Institutional arrangements for governance, oversight and evaluation in the UN | 989 |
| | Evaluation in the UN System | 1460 |
| | Oversight and Evaluation in the UN System | 1217 |
| **C. Contributions to UN reform and management** | | |
| 2012 | Delivering as One Evaluation Report (summary, main report, SG note) | 882 |
| | UNEG Guidance on Preparing Management Responses to UNDAF Evaluations | 128 |
| | UNEG Guidance on Preparing Terms of Reference for UNDAF Evaluations | 136 |
| 2011 | EG Contribution to the evaluation of Delivering as One pilot initiatives Background Document Prepared for the IV High-Level Intergovernmental Conference on | 20 |

| | | |
|---|---|---:|
| | Delivering as One, Montevideo (November 2011) | |
| | Frequently Asked Questions for UNDAF Evaluations | 1366 |
| 2008 | Evaluability Assessments of the Programme Country Pilots, Delivering as One UN: Synthesis Report | 5595 |
| | UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One Evaluability Assessment – Report on Uruguay | 3862 |
| | UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One – Evaluability Assessment Report on Cape Verde | 3273 |
| | UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One – Evaluability Assessment Report on Rwanda | 2936 |
| | UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One – Evaluability Assessment Report on Pakistan | 2577 |
| | UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One – Evaluability Assessment Report on Tanzania | 2396 |
| | UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One – Evaluability Assessment Report on Mozambique | 2843 |
| | UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One – Evaluability Assessment Report on Viet Nam | 2361 |
| | UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One – Evaluability Assessment Report on Albania | 2219 |
| 2007 | DAC/UNEG Joint Task Force on Professional Peer Reviews of Evaluation Functions in Multilateral Organizations – Framework for Professional Peer Reviews | 1152 |
| | The Role of Evaluation in Results-Based Management | 2179 |
| 2006 | UNEG Study on the Evaluability of the UN Development Assistance Framework | 811 |
| **D. Reports on major activities** | | |
| 2012 | EPE 2012 Seminar Report | 255 |
| | UNEG EPE 2012 – Report on Process and Lessons Learned | 138 |
| | 2012 AGM Report | 38 |
| | NONIE 2012 MEETING REPORT 19-20 April 2012, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy | 207 |
| | Update note on Peer Reviews of Evaluation in UN Organizations | 826 |
| 2011 | Report of the AGM 2011 | 29 |
| 2010 | 2010 Evaluation Practice Exchange Seminar, Vienna, Austria, 25 May 2010 | 335 |
| | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2010 | 1493 |
| 2009 | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2009 | 2169 |
| 2008 | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2008 | 1205 |
| 2007 | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2007 | 143 |
| 2006 | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2006 | 36 |
| 2005 | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2005 | 2115 |
| 2004 | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2004 | 22 |
| 2002 | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2002 | 21 |
| 2001 | Report of the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2001 | 13 |

Source: UNEG website, from December 2012 to January 2013

**Observations:**

a) Most normative documents were completed during the initial years of UNEG up to 2008;

b) As from 2007, the preferred formula was that of guidance documents and handbooks or notes on various topics;

c) Under the section of contribution to UN reform and management, the major outputs appear to have been related to the evaluation of UNDAF and Results-Based Management as well as the evaluation of Delivering as One;

d) It is interesting to note that of the six most downloaded documents, the very basic normative documents concerning standards for evaluation and norms for evaluation come by far the first. Next is the guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation followed by the ethical guidelines and the code of conduct. The series of reports concerning the evaluability assessment of the programme country pilots for Delivering as One are also consulted very often.

The actual ranking is as follows:
1. Standards for evaluation in the UN system (2005)         :         36,712 downloads

2. Norms for evaluation in the UN system (2005)          :         33,396

3. Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation –
towards UNEG guidance          :         10,889

4. Evaluability assessments of the programme country pilots,
Delivering as One UN: Synthesis Report         :         5,595

5. UNEG code of conduct for evaluation in the UN system     :         3,526
(the eight separate reports on the evaluability of pilot countries
average around 2600 downloads per report)

6. UNEG quality checklist for evaluation terms of reference
and inception reports         :         2,777

**ANNEX J: OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPATION IN THE TASK FORCES, ORGANISING COMMITTEES AND AGM**

**Participation in Task Forces, Organising Committees 2011-13 and AGM 2010-12**
Source: UNEG Website, data compiled in March 2013 / data on AGM from annual AGM reports

*Legend: B = blue cell, R = red cell, ✓ = AGM participation*

| Members | ENW | HR&GE | IE | NEC | JE | SEF | N&S | PR | WG-KM | EPE | NONIE | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CTBTO | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| DPI | | | | | | B | B | | | | | | | |
| DPKO | | | B | | | B | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FAO | B | B | R | | B | R | B | R | | R | B | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| GEF | | | | | | | | R | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| IAEA | B | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| ICAO | | | | | | | | B | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| IFAD | | | B | | | | B | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| ILO | B | B | B | B | B | | B | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| IMO | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| IOM | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| ITC | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| JIU (obs) | B | | | | | | B | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| MDG-F (obs) | | | | | B | | | | R | | B | | | ✓ |
| OCHA | | | B | | R | | B | | | B | B | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| OHCHR | | R | | | | | B | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| OIOS | R | B | B | B | B | B | | | | R | B | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| OPCW | B | | | | | | | | B | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNAIDS | | B | B | B | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNCDF | | | B | | B | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNCTAD | B | | | | | | B | | | | | | | |
| UNDESA | B | | B | | B | | | | | | | | | |
| UNECA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNECE | B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNECLAC | B | | | | | B | | | | | | | | |
| UNDP | B | B | R | B | B | B | B | B | R | B | R | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNEP | B | | R* | | | | B | | | B | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNESCAP | | | B | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNESCO | R | B | B | | | B | R | B | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNESCWA | B | | B | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNFPA | | B | B | B | B | | B | | B | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNHCR | | | | | B | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNODC | | | | | | B | | | | | | | | |
| UNOSS (pen) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HABITAT | B | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNICEF | | B | B | R | R | | R | | B | R | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UN WOMEN | B | R | R | R | B | | B | | B | | B | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNIDO | B | | B | | | B | B | | | | R | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNRWA | | | B | | | B | B | | B | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| UNV | | B | | | B | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| WFP | B | B | | | | B | B | B | | B | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| WHO | B | | | | | | B | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| WIPO | B | | B | | | | B | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| WMO | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| W. Bank (obs) | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | |
| WTO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Chair / Co-Chair / Convener | | Member |
|---|---|---|---|

* UNEP was interim co-Chair of the IE-TF

| ** ENW | : | Evaluation of Normative Work Task Force |
|---|---|---|
| HR&GE | : | Human Rights and Gender Equality Task Force |
| IE | : | Impact Evaluation Task Force |
| NEC | : | National Evaluation Capacity Task Force |
| JE | : | Joint Evaluation Task Force |
| SEF | : | Strengthening the Evaluation Function Task Force |
| N&S | : | Norms and Standards Task Force |
| WG-KM | : | Working Group on Knowledge Management |
| NONIE | : | Network of Networks for Impact Evaluation, Organising Committee |
| EPE | : | Evaluation Practice Exchange 2012 Seminar Organising Committee |
| PR | : | Peer Review Task Force |